

Remarks

In response to the Office Action dated July 18, 2007, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Interview Summary

A telephone interview was conducted on August 22, 2007 between Examiner Addy and Applicant's representative. During the interview the deficiencies of Bellovin were discussed. Particularly, it was discussed that Bellovin does not describe retrieving and restoring the private communication information into the outgoing communication. The Examiner conceded that Bellovin was indeed deficient in regards to all of the independent claims. The Examiner indicated that a new search would be required.

102 Rejections

Claims 26-28, 31, 33-36, 40 and 42-50 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Bellovin (US Pat 5,958,052). The applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

The Office Action rejects independent claim 26 under 35 USC §102(b) by asserting that Bellovin discloses each and every claim element. However, independent claim 26 recites elements not taught or disclosed by Bellovin. As a representative example, amended claim 26 recites, in pertinent part,

“[a] method for a communication network to restore private communication information to a communication...comprising... retrieving the private communication information and placing the private communication information into the outgoing communication...”

Bellovin is concerned with filtering information received from devices external to its domain by removing private information (i.e. IP addresses and domain names) before forwarding the information to devices within its domain. (Abstract; Col. 5, l. 53-55; Col. 7, l. 51-67; Col. 8, l. 31-41; Col. 9, l. 18-28). Bellovin does not describe retrieving the external IP addresses previously screened and placing the IP addresses into an outgoing communication. Bellovin, therefore, fails to describe retrieving the private

communication information and placing the private communication information into the outgoing communication. As such, independent claim 26 is allowable over Bellovin for failing to anticipate each and every element of independent claim 26. Independent claims 31, 35 and 44 recite similar subject matter and are allowable for at least the same reason. Claims 27-28, 33-34, 36, 40, 42-43 and 45-50 depend from an allowable independent claim 26, 31, 35 or 44 and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

103 Rejections

The Office Action rejects dependent claims 29-30, 32, 37-39 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bellovin in view of what appears to be a combination of implied official notice and/or an inherency argument concerning a variety of features. However, dependent claims 29-30, 32, 37-39 and 41 depend from and share all of the features of their respective base claims 26, 31, 35 and 44. As all of the base claims are allowable over Bellovin as discussed above in regards to the §102 rejections for failing to describe each and every claim element, the office action has also failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for the same reasons. MPEP 2142. As such, claims 29-30, 32, 37-39 and 41 are also allowable over Bellovin and either of official notice or inherency.

Conclusion

Applicants assert that the application including claims 26-50 is in condition for allowance. Applicants request reconsideration in view of the remarks above and further request that a Notice of Allowability be provided. Should the Examiner have any questions, please contact the undersigned.

No fees are believed due. However, please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 03, 2007

/Arno T. Naeckel/
Arno T. Naeckel
Reg. No. 56,114

Withers & Keys, LLC
P.O. Box 71355
Marietta, Ga 30007-1355
(770) 518-9822